

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/684,324 | STUCHLIK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Terrence R. Till | 1744 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: allowed

(1) Terrence R. Till.

(3) _____

(2) F. Agovino.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 November 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 10/16/2006, the examiner called Applicant's representative to request that figures 1,3, 4, 6 and 8 be labeled "Amended" as they have been modified from the patented drawings. Additionally, the examiner and the applicant discussed the papers submitted 10/10/03. Applicant's representative had stated in his remarks that he had provided a substitute specification. The examiner called to see if applicant's representative truly meant to submit a substitute specification. Applicant's representative stated that the substitute specification was for the examiner's benefit; not meant as an official substitute specification amendment. On 10/18/06, applicant's representative faxed new drawings in response to the above requirement. On 11/1/06, the examiner told applicant's representative that the substitute specification had been categorized as for the examiner's benefit and not entered. .